```
UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
17:20:54
        1
        2
                          WESTERN DISTRICT OF NEW YORK
        3
        4
        5
           UNITED STATES OF AMERICA
                                      ) 19CR227
                          Plaintiff
        6
           VS.
        7
                                       Buffalo, New York
           PETER GERACE, JR.
                                       ) October 27, 2021
                       Defendants.
                                             10:30 a.m.
        8
                     - - - - - X
        9
           MOTION ARGUMENT
           Transcribed from an Electronic Recording Device
       10
                           TRANSCRIPT OF PROCEEDINGS
       11
                    BEFORE THE HONORABLE MICHAEL J. ROEMER
                         UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE
       12
       13
           BRENDAN T. CULLINANE, ESQ.
           JOSEPH M. TRIPI, ESQ.
       14
           Assistant United States Attorneys
       15
           138 Delaware Avenue
           Buffalo, New York 14202
       16
       17
           STEPHEN M. COHEN, ESQ.
           HARMONY A. HEALY, ESQ.
       18
           Hogan Willig
           2410 North Forest Road
           Suite 301
       19
           Amherst, New York 14068
       20
              -and-
           JOSEPH M. LATONA, ESQ.
       21
           42 Delaware Avenue
           Suite 700
           Buffalo, New York 14202
       22
       23
          B. Macaluso - USPO
       24
           COURT REPORTER: Karen J. Clark, Official Court Reporter
                           Karenclark1013@AOL.com
       25
                           100 State Street
                           Rochester, New York 14614
```

```
1
        2
                                PROCEEDING
        3
        4
        5
                         THE CLERK: United States District Court for
        6
        7
            the Western District of New York is now in session.
                                                                     The
17:20:58
        8
            Honorable Michael J. Roemer presiding.
                         Appearing we're here on the matter of the
17:21:00
        9
17:21:02
       10
            United States versus Peter Gerace, case No. 19CR227, for
       11
            a motion. Counsel for the government, please state your
17:21:24
            name for the record.
17:21:26
       12
17:21:27
       13
                         MR. CULLINANE: Good morning, your Honor.
            Brendan Cullinane and Joseph Tripi on behalf of the
17:21:28
       14
            United States.
17:21:31
       15
                         THE CLERK: Counsel for the Defendant,
17:21:31
       16
            please state your name for the record.
17:21:32
       17
                         MR. COHEN: Good morning, Steven M. Cohen
17:21:33
       18
            and Harmony Healy, Hogan Willig here for the Defendant.
17:21:36
       19
17:21:44
       20
                         MAGISTRATE JUDGE ROEMER: Don't forget Mr.
       2.1
            LaTona.
17:21:46
17:21:47
       22
                         MR. COHEN: And Joseph LaTona.
17:22:28
       23
                         THE CLERK: Thank you.
17:22:28
       24
                         MAGISTRATE JUDGE ROEMER: Good morning.
      25
            We're her for oral argument on the defendant's motion to
17:22:30
```

```
1
            modify his conditions of release. Are we ready to go.
17:22:32
        2
                         MR. COHEN: We are, your Honor.
17:22:36
        3
17:22:37
        4
                         MR. CULLINANE: Yes, your Honor.
                         MAGISTRATE JUDGE ROEMER: Mr. Cohen, what I
17:22:38
        5
            can discern, you want, basically, three things, right?
17:22:40
        7
            You want to go from home detention to curfew, right.
17:22:44
        8
                         MR. COHEN: That's correct, sir.
17:22:48
                         MAGISTRATE JUDGE ROEMER: You want the
17:22:48
        9
17:22:49
       10
            defendant to be able to come and go from his business
            and needs to have no more restriction on 7:30 to 10:30
17:22:51
       11
17:22:56
       12
            in the morning.
17:22:57
       13
                         MR. COHEN: That's correct, sir.
17:22:58
       14
                         MAGISTRATE JUDGE ROEMER: And you want him
17:22:59
       15
            to be able to taste test alcohol as part of his
            business.
17:23:04
       16
17:23:04
       17
                        MR. COHEN: Yes, sir.
                         MAGISTRATE JUDGE ROEMER:
       18
                                                    Is there anything
17:23:05
17:23:07
       19
            else or those are the three main things.
       20
17:23:09
                         MR. COHEN: While the second thing you said
            and while slightly correct, I want him to be able to go
17:23:11
17:23:15
       22
            to and from his business, I don't want my request to be
17:23:37
       23
            perceived as that is the only place I'd like to him to
17:23:42
       24
            be able to visit. I'd like him to be able to simply
17:23:46
       25
            come and go as he please.
```

```
1
17:23:48
                         MAGISTRATE JUDGE ROEMER: Well, on curfew,
        2
            he would be able to do that.
17:23:50
        3
                         MR. COHEN:
17:23:51
        4
                                     Yes.
                         MAGISTRATE JUDGE ROEMER: And he would just
17:23:51
        5
17:23:54
            need to be home by a certain time.
        7
                         MR. COHEN: That's correct.
17:23:55
                         MAGISTRATE JUDGE ROEMER: So I view that as
17:23:56
        8
            one of the three things that I just said.
17:23:57
        9
                         MR. COHEN: Right.
17:24:00
       10
17:24:00
       11
                         MAGISTRATE JUDGE ROEMER: But he has a
            specific condition, a limitation on his ability to go to
17:24:01
       12
17:24:04
       13
            his business right now.
17:24:05
       14
                         MR. COHEN: Right.
17:24:05
       15
                         MAGISTRATE JUDGE ROEMER: And you want
            relief from that.
17:24:07
       16
                         MR. COHEN: That's correct, sir. And also
       17
17:24:07
            he has a limitation on not being able to have alcohol as
17:24:09
       18
17:24:13
       19
            you probably said.
       20
17:24:13
                         MAGISTRATE JUDGE ROEMER: Okay. I'll hear
       2.1
            from you then. You can stay there or come up to the
17:24:14
            podium. I draw the line at laying down. Okay.
17:24:18
       22
17:24:22
       23
                         MR. COHEN:
                                      Thank you, sir. Your Honor
17:24:28
       24
            we're seeking to amend the condition, conditions of the
            defendant's release pursuant to 18 U.S.C. Section
       25
17:24:32
```

1

17:24:34 2 17:24:39 3 17:24:44 17:24:50 5 17:24:54 6 7 17:24:58 17:25:02 8 17:25:05 9 17:25:13 10 17:25:18 11 12

3142(a)(2). The Court must order a release on a person's own recognizance, unless the Court reasonably believes that his being on his own recognizance won't assure his appearance in court or his release will impose a danger to the community. Naturally, 18 U.S.C. talks about nothing contained therein shall in any way affect the presumption of innocence, and, of course, I'm referring to sub chapter (j), which is presumption of innocence. What we have here is a complete absence of any evidence that shows my client is a danger to the community.

17:25:22 17:25:24 13 17:25:27 14 17:25:33 15 17:25:38 16 17:25:44 17 17:25:51 18 17:25:55 19 20 17:25:58 2.1 17:26:02 17:26:05 22 17:26:09 23 17:26:12 24

25

17:26:15

Judge, I've been doing this a long time.

The government has managed to keep my client on a very tight leash on the promise that at some point, they will have evidence or we saw a Facebook post two years ago that suggests my client may have been with a person who put a threat to another person. I have never seen the Facebook post, and it's never been turned over. And Mr. Tripi, I can show where it's located, says, "we're investigating it." If it takes two years to investigate a Facebook post, I suggest there is either nothing there or maybe they need somebody else to investigate it. But I have no evidence that my client poses a threat to anyone, no evidence that he has ever threatened anyone.

1 17:26:18 2 17:26:24 3 17:26:28 4 17:26:32 5 17:26:36 6 7 17:26:40 17:26:45 8 17:26:50 17:26:53 10 17:26:56 11 17:26:59 12 17:27:05 13 17:27:10 14 17:27:40 15 17:27:44 16 17:27:46 17 18 17:27:49 17:27:55 19 17:27:58 20 21 17:28:03 17:28:26 22 17:28:29 23 17:28:34 24

25

17:28:47

There is, of course, Katrina Nigro, who my office has dubbed "Hurricane Katrina." She is currently in jail, where she belongs. She is -- she goes on the radio and talks about how my client has had poker games in her house. She got the former defense attorney, Joel Daniels, who has been a mentor to me my entire career, and the man is a pillar of ethics, but she got him thrown off the case because of the suggestion that he was somehow playing cards with judges and law enforcement officers in their house, which is something that never happened. She claimed on the radio that Greg Trotter, an Amherst police lieutenant, detective lieutenant, was fired for taking bribes. Detective Lieutenant Trotter was promoted in the Amherst Police and he is in excellent status there, and he will be, at some point, testifying, if they put Katrina Nigro on the stand, that everything she stated was an untruth. just as Robert Jackson, the namesake of this building, wrote, "Using informers is a dirty business." This is U.S. v. Prairie, 572 F 2d 1316, 1978. The Ninth Circuit observed, "by definition, criminal informants are cut from untrustworthy cloth and must be carefully watched by the government and the courts to prevent them from falsely accusing the innocent, from manufacturing

1 17:28:50 evidence against those under suspicion of crime, and for 2 lying under oath." U.S. v. Bernal-Obeso, 989 F. 2d 331, 17:28:53 3 Ninth Circuit. There is an entire section about the use 17:29:00 17:29:02 5 of informants like Katrina Nigro in this book, 17:29:07 6 Prosecutorial Misconduct, Second Edition, Bennett L. Gershman, section 1:26. There has been no risk of 7 17:29:12 flight shown. Peter is the owner of a home locally, 17:29:15 8 owns a business locally, has a child enrolled in school 17:29:21 locally, has spent his entire life here locally, has 17:29:25 10 11 parents who live locally. He is continuing to invest 17:29:29 big money in his home and business with renovations. 12 17:29:32 His 15-year-old son is dependent on Mr. Gerace for 17:29:35 13 transportation to social events. He surrendered his 17:29:40 14 17:29:44 15 passport and he is pushing hard to get his case to trial because he wants to be exonerated. And if your Honor 17:29:47 16 were a fly in my office, you could hear the phone calls 17:29:51 17 17:29:55 from Peter saying, "When am I getting my trial? 18 my case going to trial?" This is not a man that poses a 17:30:00 19 17:30:20 20 flight risk or seeking is to evade the process. He is 2.1 on electronic monitoring. He has the largest ankle 17:30:24 17:30:27 22 bracelet I've seen in my career. He has been forced to 17:30:32 23 wear an electronic monitoring, which, under similar 17:30:35 24 circumstances, usually assures that someone remains 25 within the Western District of New York, not in their 17:30:38

1

2

3

5

17:30:41

17:30:44

17:30:48

17:30:52

own home. If they are on home confinement, yes. But then there are times when people use ankle bracelets to make sure they stay in the district when they are not 100 percent confined find to home. There has been no specific or verifiable threat of any danger by Peter to anyone. Nothing close to the required clear and convincing evidence that the defendant poses a threat to anyone.

MAGISTRATE JUDGE ROEMER: Mr. Cohen, I hate to interrupt you, but you seem to be arguing that there should be no conditions that he should be released on his own recognizance. That boat sailed. A judge down in Florida said he should be released on conditions and Judge Sinatra said he should be released on conditions. You're here today to argue about how these conditions should be modified. I'm more than happy to hear you argue today that he shouldn't be put on home detention in the first place, but I'm not going to decide that today; that is not before me. What is before me is modifying the conditions of release.

MR. COHEN: I understand that, Judge, but 18 U.S.C. 3142 and 3145 give this Court -- gives your Honor very broad discretion and you can, on your own motion at any time change conditions if you feel.

17:31:10 6 7 17:31:16 17:31:19 8 17:31:22 9 17:31:22 10 17:31:24 11 12 17:31:29 17:31:34 13 17:31:40 14 17:31:43 15 16 17:32:01 17 17:32:03 17:32:06 18 17:32:10 19 17:32:12 20 2.1 17:32:16 17:32:18 22 17:32:49 23 17:32:56 24 25 17:32:59

1 MAGISTRATE JUDGE ROEMER: That is where we 17:33:04 2 are now. You are asking for the conditions to be 17:33:05 3 17:33:08 4 changed. MR. COHEN: But if you're asking me and you 17:33:08 5 17:33:10 did, do I think that he should be released, should he 6 have been released on his own recognizance, yes, yes, I 7 17:33:13 do, sir, especially given there has been no evidence 17:33:17 8 presented. 17:33:20 9 MAGISTRATE JUDGE ROEMER: 17:33:20 10 And I totally get 11 I totally understand that, but we're not there. 17:33:22 He has already had a detention hearing down in Florida 12 17:33:25 and released on conditions and Mr. Daniels sought a 17:33:27 13 modification of those conditions, and Judge Sinatra 17:33:31 14 17:33:34 15 granted that. Judge Sinatra found that those were the least restrictive conditions necessary to assure his 17:33:38 16 appearance and assure that he is not a danger to the 17:33:41 17 18 17:33:44 community. So we're already there. And the reason I bring this up, and as you know, you brought it up in 17:33:48 19 17:33:52 20 your papers, we can modify the conditions at any time, 2.1 right. 17:33:55 17:33:55 22 MR. COHEN: Yes, sir. 17:33:56 23 MAGISTRATE JUDGE ROEMER: If you want to 17:33:57 24 reopen the detention hearing, that is a different. 25 There is a different standard there. You have to show a 17:34:00

1 change in circumstances. And it's a totally different 17:34:02 2 ball game. That is why I started off today, here are 17:34:05 3 the three things you want. Let's try to stick to those 17:34:09 three things. If you want to move to reopen the 17:34:12 5 17:34:16 detention hearing, you should do that. But you haven't 6 7 done it. Okay. 17:34:18 MR. COHEN: You're right. You're completely 17:34:19 8 right. The only thing I would respectfully adjust in 17:34:22 9 what your Honor said is, Judge Sinatra didn't say these 17:34:25 10 are the least restrictive measures that would assure his 17:34:28 11 17:34:31 12 appearance and eliminate his danger to the community. 17:34:51 13 MAGISTRATE JUDGE ROEMER: Geez, I thought he did because there were transcript cites that were in the 17:34:53 14 17:34:56 15 papers and he said something to the effect that the judge in Florida didn't impose the least restrictive 17:34:58 16 conditions. 17:35:02 17 18 MR. COHEN: Right, that is what he said. 17:35:03 MAGISTRATE JUDGE ROEMER: So I took that 17:35:05 19 17:35:06 20 then that he then imposed what he thought were the least 2.1 restrictive conditions, right. 17:35:22 17:35:23 22 MR. COHEN: I think what Judge Sinatra did, 17:35:25 23 as your Honor said, that Judge Valle, V-a-l-l-e, what 17:35:30 24 Judge Valle did was not the least restrictive, so then 25 17:35:36 he imposed these. But I don't know that his Honor made

1 the determination that these conditions would be the 17:35:39 2 least restrictive that would assure the appearance. 17:35:43 3 MAGISTRATE JUDGE ROEMER: I think he did. 17:35:48 4 That is what you're supposed to do that is what the 17:35:51 5 statute says you're supposed to do. So, my only point, 17:35:53 6 7 we're here today to argue, you want certain 17:35:57 modifications to the conditions of release. We're not 17:36:01 8 starting over with whether he should be detained or not 17:36:03 9 be detained or what the conditions should be all over 17:36:06 10 again. 17:36:09 11 17:36:09 12 MR. COHEN: So I would point out, Judge, that he is in complete compliance with all of the terms 17:36:12 13 17:36:14 that have been required of him. The Federal Probation 14 17:36:18 15 Office stated that he has no concerns at all that the defendant poses a flight risk and has no objections to 17:36:31 16 our requested change in the conditions of the 17:36:35 17 defendant's release from home detention to curfew. 17:36:37 18 17:36:41 19 attached to my reply papers at exhibit -- I think it was 20 17:36:45 the last exhibit, is a letter from -- yeah, exhibit D to 21 my reply papers, actually, a letter from Mr. Macaluso, 17:36:51 17:36:55 22 so, stating exactly that. 17:36:57 23 MAGISTRATE JUDGE ROEMER: I've discussed it 17:36:59 24 with Mr. Macaluso, and I -- really, just about 15, 20 25 minutes ago, and he says he has been fully compliant, so 17:37:03

1 2 17:37:08 MR. COHEN: Judge, I think you've got it. 17:37:08 3 Ι think you understand my points. I can, you know, run 17:37:11 4 through all of the reasons that I feel that the 17:37:14 5 17:37:16 restrictions placed on Mr. Gerace are unnecessary, and, 6 you'll forgive me, but discriminatory and punitive. 7 17:37:22 17:37:25 I think Mr. Tripi, you know, has some animus towards my 8 client that I don't have any evidence to support the 17:37:32 basis for the animus. 17:37:37 10 11 MAGISTRATE JUDGE ROEMER: I'll tell you, I 17:37:39 12 don't like when accusations are thrown around. You just 17:37:41 17:37:44 13 said you have no evidence of that other than he is aggressively pursuing this case. And if he said the 17:37:47 14 17:37:51 15 same thing about you, I would not to like hear it from him. 17:38:10 16 MR. COHEN: I have nothing to support the 17:38:10 17 The things he has done, is a matter of record. 17:38:11 18 animus. Referring the IOC and referring to organized crime, 17:38:15 19 20 17:38:19 these things are repugnant as a civil rights attorney, 2.1 but you got it, Judge, and you've heard my arguments and 17:38:23 17:38:28 22 I'm available to respond to any arguments. 17:38:31 23 MAGISTRATE JUDGE ROEMER: Thank you. 17:38:32 2.4 MR. COHEN: Thank you. 25 MAGISTRATE JUDGE ROEMER: Mr. Cullinane, are 17:38:33

1 you arguing? 17:38:34 2 Yes. 17:38:34 3 MR. CULLINANE: Thank you, Judge. MAGISTRATE JUDGE ROEMER: 17:38:35 4 Okav. MR. CULLINANE: Judge, thank you very much. 17:38:37 5 17:38:46 6 Judge, I want to address some of the things that Mr. Cohen stated on the record. It's clear to me, the Court 7 17:38:48 17:38:52 is very familiar with this case and gone through the 8 docket and is familiar with the procedural history here. 17:38:54 In fact, the judge, the defendant appears before Judge 17:38:59 10 Valle down in Miami back in March. And, at that time, 11 17:39:07 Judge Valle said this is an interesting case, in fact, I 17:39:25 12 would order you detained if not for the government's 17:39:29 13 motion at that time. And the government has explained 17:39:32 14 17:39:35 15 its position and why it took that position at time and asked for, rather than detention, restrictive 17:39:39 16 conditions. And the government did not oppose home 17:39:42 17 detention at that time. The defendant then appears 17:39:44 18 before you and there is an order setting conditions of 17:39:47 19 20 17:39:49 release on the record, in which your signature is on and 2.1 it contains information about the conditions imposed 17:39:53 upon Mr. Gerace, which include, among other things, 17:39:56 22 17:40:00 23 electronic monitoring for home detention and he ordered 17:40:06 24 that he not imbibe any alcohol. What coincides around 25 the same time is the fact that when this defendant 17:40:09

1 appeared before Judge Valle down in Miami, the probation 17:40:12 2 report stated he had used cocaine one year earlier than 17:40:17 3 that date. Turned out he had cocaine in his system at 17:40:20 that time and he had lied to the probation office. 17:40:24 5 17:40:27 6 our had our office known then at that time. That would 7 have changed our position. 17:40:31 MAGISTRATE JUDGE ROEMER: Mr. Cullinane, 17:40:32 8 same thing to you that I told to Mr. Cohen. We're here 17:40:34 We're going forward. Both people seem to want to 17:40:37 10 go backwards to what happened in Florida or what 17:40:43 11 12 happened after that. And as far as this testing 17:40:46 17:40:50 13 positive for cocaine, I assume that was brought up to Judge Sinatra. 17:40:53 14 17:40:54 15 MR. CULLINANE: It was, it was in the 17:40:55 16 papers. 17 MAGISTRATE JUDGE ROEMER: Okay. Then he had 17:40:56 that. He made his decision. 17:40:57 18 MR. CULLINANE: You're exactly right, and 17:41:01 19 17:41:02 20 Judge, I mention that for this fact, and I'll get right 2.1 to the point here. Mr. Gerace would like to change his 17:41:05 conditions from home detention to curfew. 17:41:11 22 17:41:15 23 defendant has demonstrated throughout his history here 17:41:17 24 and all of his characteristics that that is not appropriate. We went before Judge Sinatra, and you're 25 17:41:20

1 exactly right of your memory of the transcript, which I 17:41:24 2 have in front of me. Judge Sinatra stated, "After 17:41:27 3 reviewing the record and after hearing from both sides, 17:41:29 4 the lesser restrictive condition that he refrain from 17:41:33 5 17:41:42 6 visiting or working at Pharaoh's, except between certain 7 designated hours, serves the purpose of Title 18 U.S.C. 17:41:48 Section 3142(c)(1)(B)." This issue has been up before 17:41:57 8 Judge Sinatra in the past. There is nothing that has 17:42:01 9 changed since the parties appeared before Judge Sinatra 17:42:04 10 17:42:07 11 regarding Mr. Gerace and any --12 MAGISTRATE JUDGE ROEMER: I think Mr. Cohen 17:42:09 17:42:11 13 argues two things that have changed. One is he has now reviewed all of the discovery in the case and he 17:42:16 14 17:42:18 15 believes the case is much weaker than he thought it was even before he started looking at it. That is his one 17:42:21 16 argument. And the second argument is there has been 17:42:25 17 compliance for the last seven months. Those are, I take 17:42:27 18 17:42:30 19 it, are the two arguments as to why the conditions 20 17:42:33 should be released. 17:42:34 2.1 MR. CULLINANE: Let me address those. 17:42:35 22 of all, he has not reviewed all of the discovery and we 17:42:39 23 have not provided Jencks material in this case. 17:42:53 24 is an offense reference to a woman named Katrina Gerace,

which he called "Hurricane Katrina." He has no

25

17:42:58

1 17:43:12 2 17:43:15 3 17:43:19 4 17:43:34 5 17:43:37 6 7 17:43:45 17:43:48 8 17:43:52 9 17:43:55 10 17:43:59 11 17:44:02 12 17:44:16 13 17:44:22 14 17:44:31 15 17:44:34 16 17:44:39 17 17:44:42 18 17:44:46 19 20 17:44:57 2.1 17:45:01 17:45:05 22 17:45:08 23 17:45:13 24

25

17:45:16

information regarding her from us of whether there is Jencks material or not, which I'm not going to confirm on the record, but Jencks material has not been provided to his office. So, in his papers, he alleges perjury and false statements and other things. As far as I know, Katrina Gerace is not charged in this courthouse or elsewhere in this district with any federal violation. So, for him saying that, that is not exactly correct, and he is attempting to mislead the Court from the character and background of Mr. Gerace and the charges in which he faces, five of which are very serious, and involve a former co-defendant, a former DEA special agent, and rather, he is trying to talk about this other person and trying to make the Court believe this one case rests on one person. I can tell you, Judge, in a proffer to this case, this case involves numerous witnesses, and it's inappropriate and improper to attempt to bludgeon the name of this one person on some unfounded belief that this person committed some sort of violation, whether before this Court or a grand That, in fact, has not happened, so it's an attempt to move away from the record before your Honor. Second, your Honor, there is information about compliance. And I know that Mr. Macaluso has

1 filed a report and you had an opportunity to speak with 17:45:19 2 him. I'm not so sure that is correct that there has 17:45:22 3 been full compliance, and my concern stems from, your 17:45:25 Honor, the motion that was put in as well as the 17:45:28 5 17:45:32 response that we filed. Mr. Cohen then filed a reply 6 7 and he said, well, Mr. Gerace is allowed to speak with 17:45:38 people from Pharaoh's, just not while he is at 17:45:45 8 Pharaoh's. Your Honor, I have the transcript which I 17:45:49 9 believe you have at docket 118. 17:45:52 10 11 MAGISTRATE JUDGE ROEMER: Before you go down 17:45:56 12 this road, Mr. Cullinane, I called Judge Sinatra and I 17:45:58 asked him --17:46:01 13 MR. CULLINANE: Yes. 17:46:02 14 MAGISTRATE JUDGE ROEMER: -- what his 17:46:03 15 position is. And he had no problem with the employees 17:46:03 16 going over to Mr. Gerace's house or talking to him on 17:46:07 17 17:46:10 18 the phone, just not at the establishment. So that is where I am. 17:46:14 19 17:46:15 20 MR. CULLINANE: Well, I actually appreciate 21 the fact that you talked to Judge Sinatra. Because I 17:46:16 have to tell you, it's a little confusing, but I think 17:46:19 22 17:46:22 23 the language was not exactly clear for us. It seemed on 17:46:26 24 the face of it he would leave a checklist for the 25 17:46:29 manager.

1 17:46:29 MAGISTRATE JUDGE ROEMER: I understand your 2 position completely. 17:46:30 3 MR. CULLINANE: So, to let you know, that is 17:46:31 4 where we're coming from. I'm not trying to mislead 17:46:33 5 17:46:36 anyone. That was our understanding. 6 7 MAGISTRATE JUDGE ROEMER: Yes. 17:46:37 17:46:38 8 MR. CULLINANE: Nevertheless, your Honor, compliance is not a changed circumstance. This issue of 17:46:40 9 Pharaoh's and whether he needs to meet with people 17:46:43 10 there, whether construction workers or other venders, or 17:46:46 11 12 17:46:49 whatever, this update to Pharaoh's, that is not a 17:46:52 13 changed circumstance. And, in fact, what Judge Sinatra said in the transcript, and which I believe he 17:46:55 14 referenced in his Webmaster, he said this transcript 17:46:57 15 will serve as well of documentation of the decision is 17:47:01 16 the fact that Mr. Gerace had an issue that came up, 17:47:04 17 17:47:09 18 rather than put anything in doubt, contact Mr. Macaluso 17:47:13 19 and work with probation, which has always been the case 20 17:47:16 that people should contact the probation officer first. 2.1 They are well trained and they can handle this. And he 17:47:19 17:47:25 22 can then work with probation to try and accommodate his 17:47:28 23 schedule and if there is some off schedule with one 17:47:31 24 contractors. That is still available to Mr. Gerace to 25 17:47:42 do. Nothing has changed the meantime since we came

1

2

17:47:45

17:49:15

17:49:18

17:49:20

17:49:23

22

23

24

25

before Judge Sinatra on this very issue.

Let me add as well, the defendant's own 17:47:49 3 determination, own evaluation, own review of the case is 17:47:52 4 also not a changed circumstance. Simply because Mr. 17:47:55 5 Cohen, and, Judge, I think for the record, obviously you 17:47:59 6 7 know this, but just simply because Mr. Cohen to date has 17:48:01 reviewed some discovery, but not everything, as I said, 17:48:05 8 Jencks has not been turned over, that doesn't mean there 17:48:09 say changed circumstance in this case. What is still 17:48:12 10 outstanding, Mr. Gerace has an indictment with five 17:48:15 11 17:48:30 12 charges against him and co-conspirators, and all of which are serious, some more serious than others. His 17:48:31 13 background, which has been problematic throughout this 17:48:35 14 17:48:38 15 time and there are no changed circumstances today that should dictate any change in what Judge Sinatra has 17:48:49 16 already ordered. Again, he went before Judge Valle and 17:48:52 17 you and Judge Sinatra, he is under the least restrictive 18 17:48:56 conditions that are imposed today, and shall not be 17:49:00 19 20 17:49:11 amended for any purpose. I'll rely, again, your Honor, on our filing 2.1 17:49:13

papers, there is more information there, but I know you're familiar with this case.

While I have the floor, though, and you'll tell me if you want me to continue, the government also

1

2

3

4

6

7

8

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

2.1

22

23

24

25

17:49:25

17:49:40

17:49:44

17:49:46

17:49:48

17:49:51

17:49:55

17:49:58

17:50:01

17:50:05

17:50:08

17:50:13

17:50:16

17:50:20

17:50:22

17:50:25

17:50:29

17:50:35

17:50:37

17:50:39

17:50:43

17:50:47

17:50:49

made a cross motion though regarding the removal of earned leave. I don't know if you want to be heard at this time on that.

17:49:45 5 MAGISTRATE JUDGE ROEMER: Sure, go ahead.

MR. CULLINANE: Judge, as we put in the papers, the government was not aware at the time and that is, obviously, in March of 2021, that while someone is on home detention, they can acquire what is called earned leave, and it's only been the last couple of months that I can tell you Mr. Tripi and I have learned about that. And as I footnoted in our response and in the cross motion section, we conferred with AUSA Tim Lynch, Joe Guerra, and the former U.S. Attorney JP Kennedy, none of whom knew about this opportunity for the defendants to apply earned leave. This is new information to us. It's not in the four corners of the order setting conditions of release. I've since had an opportunity to review and become aware of documents that are signed between the defendant himself and the probation officer that document how a defendant understands that he can acquire, he or she can acquire earned leave during the course of their being on home detention. Those are not documents that the government is a party to. So I'm providing some information and

1 17:50:52 2 17:50:56 3 17:50:58 4 17:51:03 5 17:51:07 6 7 17:51:11 17:51:15 8 17:51:19 17:51:20 10 17:51:24 11 17:51:27 12 17:51:32 13 17:51:35 14 17:51:42 15 17:51:46 16 17:51:50 17 17:51:51 18 17:51:52 19 20 17:51:55 21 17:51:59 17:52:03 22 17:52:05 23 17:52:06 24

25

17:52:07

background that none of us knew and in fact of the persons I mentioned I'm the least experience but you have people obviously like Joe Guerra and JP Kennedy, nearly 30 years in the office, on this opportunity of earned leave. And, Judge, we're obviously opposed to any modification to curfew at this time. But we're also asking that earned relief be removed from Mr. Gerace.

MAGISTRATE JUDGE ROEMER: I can tell you the leave program has been in existence over 20 years here in this court. I hear you that maybe you didn't know about it. I discussed it with probation about, you know, educating everyone about this program. It's been around for a long time. So, but I'm not going to remove — the program is in existence, he is eligible for it, he gets it. I'm not changing the program or taking him out of it at this time.

MR. CULLINANE: Judge, I ask you to consider the fact, as we put in the moving papers, the fact that we've become aware that he has been in places that have been part of the investigation in which criminal conduct has occurred. As a result, we're asking to you seriously consider --

MAGISTRATE JUDGE ROEMER: I'll let you do this, if you want to submit to Court and the counsel a

1 list of places you don't think he should go, I'll listen 17:52:10 2 to that, or whatever. But the only limitation on the 17:52:13 3 earned leave, it says, specifically, you can't go to a 17:52:19 4 bar or any place where its primary activity is serving 17:52:23 5 alcohol. There are no other limitations. So, if you 17:52:28 7 want to tell me, okay, he shouldn't be able to go here, 17:52:33 there or whatever, I'll consider that. But I'm not 17:52:38 8 taking him off the program. Okay? 17:52:41 9 MR. CULLINANE: Judge, finally, the 17:52:44 10 government put in a motion for GPS data relating to Mr. 17:52:46 11 Gerace since he has been on this home detention. 17:53:00 12 17:53:03 13 MAGISTRATE JUDGE ROEMER: When they go on 17:53:04 14 home detention, particularly Mr. Gerace, was on GPS, there is a record of where he went. Probation office 17:53:16 15 has reviewed that. If he didn't go where he was 17:53:18 16 supposed to go, they would have violated. And that 17:53:21 17 didn't happen and they informed me he went where he said 18 17:53:26 17:53:30 19 he was going to go. 20 17:53:37 MR. CULLINANE: And I understand. Judge, that would be, as I think I heard you, that would 17:53:39 21 17:53:41 22 be, if he went, for example, a bar, which is a place 17:53:44 23 that primarily serves alcohol for only that purpose. 17:53:48 24 MAGISTRATE JUDGE ROEMER: If they say, you 25 17:53:49 can go to this restaurant, this restaurant here, and you

```
1
            can eat dinner. If it shows that he didn't go to that
17:53:52
        2
            restaurant and went to another location, he would be in
17:53:56
        3
            violation.
17:54:01
        4
                         MR. CULLINANE: Correct.
17:54:08
        5
                         MAGISTRATE JUDGE ROEMER: That didn't
17:54:08
        6
        7
            happen.
17:54:09
                         MR. CULLINANE: Correct.
17:54:09
        8
17:54:10
                         MAGISTRATE JUDGE ROEMER:
                                                     Okay.
                         MR. CULLINANE: And we're not asking for a
17:54:11
       10
17:54:13
       11
            violation of probation rules, we're asking because of
       12
            our investigation --
17:54:15
                         MAGISTRATE JUDGE ROEMER: I'm denying your
17:54:16
       13
17:54:17
       14
            request. Okay.
17:54:18
       15
                         MR. CULLINANE:
                                          Thank you, Judge.
                         MAGISTRATE JUDGE ROEMER: All right.
17:54:19
       16
            Anything else then, Mr. Cullinane?
17:54:20
       17
       18
                         MR. CULLINANE: Not at this time, your
17:54:21
            Honor. Thank you.
17:54:24
       19
17:54:24
       20
                         MAGISTRATE JUDGE ROEMER: Mr. Macaluso or
       2.1
            Officer Macaluso?
17:54:26
17:54:27
       22
                         PROBATION: Yes, your Honor. In terms of
17:54:29
       23
            our office, we submitted a memo to the court dated
            October first. The defendant has been in compliance
17:54:33
       24
       25
            with his conditions of release for his seven months on.
17:54:35
```

1 We have no objection with him going from home detention 17:54:39 2 to curfew staying on electronic monitoring with all 17:54:43 3 conditions to remain. 17:54:46 MAGISTRATE JUDGE ROEMER: Okay. You have no 17:54:49 5 objection if he goes from home detention to curfew. 17:54:50 6 What about going to his business? 7 17:54:53 The business, your Honor, that 17:54:57 8 PROBATION: would be up to your Honor. I did tell the defendant 17:54:59 9 that and I told Mr. Cullinane that if you wanted him 17:55:02 10 there at a certain time, I could put a zone around the 17:55:06 11 business and he could only be there for a certain time. 17:55:09 12 If he was on curfew from 7 to 7 and you only warranted 17:55:12 13 him at the business from 7 a.m. to noon, I could put a 17:55:16 14 zone around the business so we would be notified if he 17:55:20 15 17:55:24 16 stayed there any longer. 17 MAGISTRATE JUDGE ROEMER: I have to ask. 17:55:25 Ιs 17:55:27 18 his ankle monitor any bigger than anybody else's ankle monitor? 17:55:32 19 20 17:55:33 PROBATION: No, your Honor. It's a standard 2.1 GPS. It's not bigger or smaller. There is a smaller 17:55:36 17:55:39 22 unit, but it's RF, but he is on GPS and so it's a little 17:55:45 23 bit bigger. 17:55:45 2.4 MAGISTRATE JUDGE ROEMER: Mr. Cohen. 25 MR. COHEN: Briefly, sir. The place where 17:55:46

1 17:55:49 2 17:55:54 3 17:55:59 17:56:02 5 17:56:07 6 7 17:56:11 17:56:17 8 17:56:20 17:56:24 10 17:56:28 11 17:56:32 12 17:56:37 13 17:56:44 14 17:56:51 15

17:56:55

17:57:05

17:57:08

17:57:12

17:57:16

17:57:21

17:57:25

17:57:36

17:57:39

17:57:44

16

17

18

19

20

2.1

22

23

24

25

my client went which was of concern to his U.S. Attorney, he went with his parents to the casino for gambling, which he had permission to do. With regard to the suggestion by the AUSA that there was no perjury and since they didn't turn over the 3500 material to me, how would I ever know? Ms. Nigro went on the radio and on social media and posted the things that she testified to the grand jury about. And if this Court has any doubt as to whether Ms. Nigro committed perjury, we would welcome a hearing. And my first witness will be Joel Daniels. Lastly, Judge, well second to last, there are scores of camera at the club at Pharaoh's on 999 Aero My client is not -- the government has not only seized all of the footage, but we can do one better, they can have live stream and they can watch what goes on at the club. And if they think there should be an additional camera, although I think almost every quare inch of that place is covered except the bathrooms, Peter will put in cameras. They are welcome to monitor. Also, their claims, tens of thousands of materials that they have against my client, if this were a civil case, that would be sanctionable trying to bury the other side with nonsensical alleged evidence. But everything they turned over to me, tens of thousands of pages, I had an

1 army at my office go through it. And as the government 17:57:48 2 concedes, there was nothing there. I'd like some of 17:57:53 3 that evidence that that will be the basis for another 17:57:56 motion, but the claim that --17:58:00 5 17:58:03 6 MAGISTRATE JUDGE ROEMER: Well, we've 7 already filed motions in the case. 17:58:05 17:58:06 8 MR. COHEN: I beg your pardon? MAGISTRATE JUDGE ROEMER: We've already 17:58:08 9 17:58:09 10 filed motions in the case, so any motion now would be 11 untimely. I have the pretrial motions in front of me 17:58:13 12 17:58:15 now. 17:58:16 13 MR. COHEN: I see. But I've been screaming in from the rafters in the motions that have been filed, 17:58:19 14 17:58:23 15 I want the evidence that they have. And if they are saying there is no other evidence than the Jencks. 17:58:26 17 MAGISTRATE JUDGE ROEMER: The discovery rule 17:58:29 does not say you have to turn over all evidence in your 17:58:31 18 case, that is not the case, that is not what the rule 17:58:35 19 20 17:58:44 says. There are certain types of evidence they have to 2.1 turn over. They don't have to turn over all their 17:58:46 17:58:49 22 evidence. They don't have to try their case before they try their case. 17:58:52 23 17:58:52 24 MR. COHEN: I understand, your Honor. 25 we also, this Court has a long and rich history of 17:58:54

1 rejecting trial by ambush. And this Court has many 17:58:58 2 times said, you know, the rules for turning over Jencks 17:59:02 3 and Giglio and things after the jury has been sworn and 17:59:06 this Court has said no, no, no. Give the defense plenty 17:59:14 5 17:59:18 of time to review this. We usually get things well before. But, in my case, I have nothing except an 7 17:59:21 indictment and the tens of thousands of pages that show 17:59:24 8 no criminality. So, I'm a little bit in the dark with 17:59:27 this entire case, and I think your Honor gets that. 17:59:32 10 With that, Judge, I rely on my papers for the balance of 17:59:35 11 my position. 17:59:39 12 17:59:39 13 MAGISTRATE JUDGE ROEMER: Thank you, sir. 17:59:40 14 MR. COHEN: Thank you. 17:59:41 15 MAGISTRATE JUDGE ROEMER: Mr. Cullinane, anything? 17:59:41 16 17 MR. CULLINANE: Just very briefly, your 17:59:42 Thank you. Judge, just as to the last point 17:59:44 18 Honor. raised by Mr. Cohen. The government has complied with 17:59:49 19 20 17:59:53 its responsibilities and requirements for discovery, 2.1 and, in particular, I referenced Jencks material, that 17:59:56 18:00:00 22 was not required to be turned over at this time. 18:00:10 23 that is what I was referring to earlier. Other than 18:00:12 24 that, we have complied with everything and they have 25 everything in their hands. 18:00:16

1 18:00:19 MAGISTRATE JUDGE ROEMER: By statute you're 2 not required. 18:00:20 3 18:00:21 4 MR. CULLINANE: Correct. We have complied. 18:00:23 Two brief points, I want to make sure and just to be 5 18:00:26 clear, I don't believe anything has changed between the 6 time we appeared before Judge Sinatra and today. Judge 7 18:00:29 Sinatra, essentially, has already looked at this issue 18:00:33 8 18:00:35 and made a determination on this and the government submits there is nothing to be changed today in terms of 18:00:37 10 18:00:40 11 home detention. 12 MAGISTRATE JUDGE ROEMER: Let's just be 18:00:41 18:00:42 13 clear, and this, again, goes back to how we started off 18:00:46 14 this argument. Mr. Cohen, basically, I think, was arguing that he should not be detained, should not be on 18:00:48 15 any type of conditions. I said, well, that 18:00:52 16 determination has already been made. The statute says I 18:00:55 17 can modify those conditions. If you wanted to say now I 18:01:00 18 want him detained, then you have to show a change of 18:01:06 19 20 18:01:08 conditions. Right? 18:01:10 2.1 MR. CULLINANE: Correct. 18:01:10 22 MAGISTRATE JUDGE ROEMER: I think those are 18:01:11 23 two different parts of the statute. And I think they 18:01:14 24 are different. I think you don't necessarily have to 25 show that anything changed in order to modify the 18:01:17

1 18:01:20 2 18:01:23 3 18:01:26 4 18:01:28 5 18:01:30 6 7 18:01:33 18:01:36 8 18:01:41 9 18:01:52 10 18:01:54 11 18:01:57 12 18:02:00 13 18:02:03 14 18:02:06 15 18:02:09 16 18:02:12 17 18:02:16 18 18:02:19 19 18:02:20 20 2.1 18:02:24 18:02:29 22 18:02:33 23 18:02:34 24 25 18:02:39

condition. I mean, that would generally be a reason why it would be something changed or whatever. But that is not that part of the statute, right? MR. CULLINANE: What is permissible here is that you have discretion and in terms of them presenting information to you regarding Mr. Gerace, nothing has changed that should dictate that there should be, within your discretion, a change in any circumstances, that Judge Sinatra, essentially, already heard about -- heard from the parties, reviewed, asked great questions about and made a determination at the end about. For those reasons, the government submits there should not be any change from home detention to curfew. Finally, Judge, you know, I just want to raise this issue, though, and I heard your order before about the fact that if we want to make a motion, ask for the list of places where he has been, Judge. MAGISTRATE JUDGE ROEMER: No, no, no. I said was you can make a motion saying he shouldn't be able to go to these places. I didn't say make a motion to find out where he had been. That is not what I said.

MR. CULLINANE: Well, and I probably misunderstood that. Let me say that, regardless, either where he is has been or where he is going, that is part

1 of the Government's investigation that is admittedly 18:02:42 2 continuing and the government is not interested and 18:02:46 3 would prefer not to publically acknowledge these 18:02:49 4 locations as part of its investigation. So we ask that 18:02:52 5 is something we wouldn't have to place publically. 18:03:03 6 7 MAGISTRATE JUDGE ROEMER: It's difficult for 18:03:06 me to tell him not to go somewhere if you don't tell me 18:03:07 8 where it is. 18:03:14 9 MR. CULLINANE: Judge, we don't mind telling 18:03:15 10 you. At this time, we don't want to publically 18:03:17 11 18:03:20 12 acknowledge that and provide that information to him 18:03:31 13 without it first being determined by this Court. don't want to put that on a public docket so that the 18:03:34 14 18:03:39 15 defendant and counsel could see this. We're asking that is something that could be done under seal, ex parte, to 18:03:42 16 the Court. 18:03:46 17 MAGISTRATE JUDGE ROEMER: 18:03:46 18 No. 18:03:48 19 MR. CULLINANE: Thank you, Judge. 18:03:49 20 MAGISTRATE JUDGE ROEMER: All right. 2.1 consider the matter submitted. Have a good day and stay 18:03:51 18:03:54 22 safe. 18:03:56 23 MR. COHEN: Thank you, Judge. 24 25

CERTIFICATE OF REPORTER I certify that the foregoing is a correct transcript of the record to the best of my ability of proceedings transcribed from the audio in the above-entitled matter. S/ Karen J. Clark, RPR Official Court Reporter